

Cascade Water Connections Working Group Meeting #2

August 13, 2009, 9 am – 12pm
Bellevue City Hall, Room 1E 108
450 110th Ave. NE, Bellevue

Welcome

The Cascade Water Connections Working Group convened for its second meeting on August 13, 2009. Bellevue Mayor Grant Degginger welcomed everyone and thanked them for being an integral part of the Cascade Water Alliance’s planning process. Mayor Degginger stated that the group will give important feedback to the Cascade Board on the options being considered for providing future water to the members of Cascade Water Alliance.

Review of June Meeting Summary and Follow-Up Materials

Lewis Michaelson, Katz & Associates, asked the group if there were any questions or comments regarding the summary of the first meeting or the follow-up materials that were sent after the meeting.

Comment: A suggestion was made to revise the meeting summary by striking the first sentence of the answer that states Seattle’s forecasts look backward in time. Since this is not the case it was agreed to strike this line from the meeting summary.

Comment: Additional information was given that Seattle’s consumption of water has also decreased because Seattle is no longer providing water to certain non-revenue areas such as supplying freshwater to Green Lake.

Presentation

Michael Gagliardo, Director of Planning, Cascade Water Alliance, gave a presentation to the group that briefly reviewed the purpose of Cascade Water Alliance and the steps that are used to determine demand forecasts. The demand forecasts are an integral part of developing a long-term water transmission and supply plan.

There was much discussion regarding the slide entitled “Forecast Using Probabilities.” Michael explained that the slide shows the risk probabilities of being able to supply water to meet demand over the long term. The less risk you want to take, the higher a demand you want to plan for, and usually the more it will cost to avoid that risk.

Comment: It was suggested to label the slide so that the 50% demand line is the best guess or zero line and then there would be a plus or minus below that line. This would make the figure easier to understand.

Andrew Graham, Planning Lead, HDR Engineering, Inc., continued the presentation by explaining the criteria used for screening individual projects. He explained the process of defining the criteria, then assigning a raw score for each project for each criterion, and then using criteria weights to reflect the emphasis stakeholders place on different criteria. Andrew Graham also provided a detailed explanation of each criterion. The criteria selected by Cascade for source evaluation are:

- Environmental Considerations
- Financial Considerations
- Implementation Considerations
- Operational Considerations
- Regional/Intergovernmental Considerations
- Supply Reliability

A more detailed explanation of each criterion was provided as a handout to the group. The group was also interested in the weights given to the sub-criteria for each criterion. Lewis confirmed that Cascade would send those out to the working group as a follow-up to the meeting.

One working group member was concerned that the way the criteria were developed, the effect of financial considerations were being hidden or masked in the overall ranking results. Michael Gagliardo reminded the group that Cascade has agreed it would run a series of sensitivity analyses including one with financial considerations set at zero so the group can see how the projects rank when cost is not a factor.

Andrew Graham reviewed a series of slides that showed the raw score for each project for each criterion. Then he reviewed how the projects would rank cumulatively if all criteria were weighted equally. Finally, he reviewed the preliminary project rankings based on the weightings developed by the Cascade board and staff

The group wanted more details about what each individual project actually entails. Michael Gagliardo stated that Cascade would provide a spreadsheet that provides more detail on each project.

Questions and comments from the group on the presentation included:

Comment: For projects that have sunk costs, they should not be given a higher score in the financial criterion because of “prior investments.” Instead, it is political decision and should be captured within regional/intergovernmental considerations.

Response: The Cascade Board had a similar discussion about whether prior investments should be included. They resolved it by including it, but with a low sub-criterion weight. Nonetheless, your feedback will be communicated to the board.

Q: How does uncertainty in projects weigh in since some are much farther along?

A: Uncertainty does affect the scores since projects that are not far along in the planning and permitting process have greater risks associated with implementation, so the Implementation criterion is primarily where we capture the risk from those uncertainties.

Comment: The Board may want to consider different land-use scenarios since those can greatly affect supply and cost. Projects that appear relatively easy or implementable based on today's land use may not be in the future.

Comment: Supply reliability should also take into account potential acts of terrorism and not just catastrophic acts of nature.

Response: At this stage it is often hard to differentiate between projects based on the threat of terrorism. Projects are basically all equal in this regard. Also, intentional contamination can happen not just at the source but in distribution of water.

Comment: Vulnerability to flooding should also be included within supply reliability.

Q: Where are interactions with the Tribes captured?

A: It is captured both in implementation and regional/intergovernmental considerations.

Comment: It seems like you could also go through the projects with a tree analysis where you address the most important criteria first or the ones that are essentially fatal flaws.

Response: You are correct that a criteria weighting approach looks at everything at the same time. Under a criteria weighting approach, the way to address your suggestion is to give more weight to the criteria you feel are most critical in enabling or stopping a project.

Q: How are synergies between projects captured?

A: Synergies are really analyzed once we develop portfolios of projects in the next phase and then sequence those over time to show how they interact with one another. Once portfolios of projects that meet the projected demand are assembled, they too can be ranked using our evaluation criteria.

Screening Criteria Exercise

The Working Group was then asked to participate in the same exercise used by the Cascade board and staff to weight the screening criteria. Each member received twenty

stickers. The members were then instructed to distribute the stickers among each criteria based on what they felt was most important. The only rule was that each member had to place at least one sticker on each criterion. The more stickers placed on a criterion meant that greater weight was given to that criterion.

The following table shows the results of both the Connections Working Group and Cascade board and staff.

Criteria	Connections Working Group	Cascade Board and Staff
Environmental	18%	16%
Financial	20%	26%
Implementation	16%	10%
Operational	15%	18%
Regional/Intergovernmental	10%	8%
Supply Reliability	21%	22%

Adjourn and Next Steps

Andrew Graham let the group know that Cascade will share the criteria weights with the Cascade Resource Management Committee. The Working Group weights will also be used as one of the cases when they run sensitivity tests. The next Working Group meeting will be spent reviewing the projects. In late September, Cascade will be making a recommendation of which projects to move forward to start building portfolios.

The next Working Group meeting is scheduled for September 10, 2009, at Kirkland City Hall, Peter Kirk Room. **NOTE THIS IS A DIFFERENT LOCATION THAN THE FIRST TWO MEETINGS.**

ALSO NOTE THAT, TO KEEP ALIGNED WITH THE CASCADE BOARD DECISION POINTS, THE FOLLOWING MEETING OF THIS GROUP WILL BE DECEMBER 11 FROM 8 AM UNTIL NOON AT BELLEVUE CITY HALL. THERE WILL BE NO OCTOBER OR NOVEMBER MEETINGS.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Attendees

Working Group Members

Walt Canter

Steve Hirschey

Bob James

Michael Johnson

Joan Kersnar

Leslie Lloyd

Ralph Mason

Linda McCrea

Beth Mountsier

Bob Pancoast

Paul Reitenbach

Lydia Reynolds-Jones

Anna Rising

Denise Smith

Dr. Leon Stucki

Jeannie Summerhays

Skip Swenson

Don Wright

Board and Staff

Bellevue Mayor Grant Degginger, Cascade Water Alliance

Michael Gagliardo, Cascade Water Alliance

Elaine Kraft, Cascade Water Alliance

Andrew Graham, HDR

Gwenn Maxfield, City of Covington

Betty Spieth, Langton Spieth

Facilitation Team

Lewis Michaelson, Katz & Associates

Bryan Jarr, Katz & Associates